

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/077,763 | 02/20/2002 | Haixiang He | 57983.000067 | 3467 | |
| 75 | 90 07/10/2006 | | EXAMINER | | |
| Thomas E. Anderson | | | PHILPOTT, JUSTIN M | | |
| Hunton & Willia 1900 K Street, N | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| Washington, DC 20006-1109 | | | 2616 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 07/10/2006 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--------------------|--------------|
| 10/077,763 | HE, HAIXIANG |
| Examiner | Art Unit |
| Justin M. Philpott | 2616 |

| | Justin M. Philpott | 2616 | |
|---|---|---|--|
| -The MAILING DATE of this communication appear | ars on the cover sheet with the d | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 03 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL | ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o | Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (| iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejecti | on. |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 | | 100(-) 1 11 | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be | filed within two month | s of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further contains the contains a final rejection, to the contains | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | ecause |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | • | dualina an almalifican | the iceuse for |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | | | the issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a (| corresponding number of finally rej | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | Od. Con attacked Nation of Nam Con | | (DTOL 204) |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | impliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | timely filed amendme | ent canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | ll be entered and an e | explanation of |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is | ot be entered s necessary and |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fai | ils to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attach | ned. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | | | nce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N | lo(s) | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed July 3, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Specifically, in applicant's discussion of Jane (pages 6-9), applicant concludes that the VID message of Jain is not a "message" as recited in applicant's claims. However, according to the well known standards of IEEE, a "message" is generally known in the art as "a combination of characters and symbols transferred from one point to another" (see, "IEEE 100: The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, 7th Edition") which can be "arbitrarily simple (a signal) or complex" (Id.), or, more generally, as "a communication sent from one object to another". Because applicant's claim language does not describe and is not limited to some type of "message" that is uniquely distinct from a "message" that is well known in the art, applicant's broadly claimed "message" is taught by Jain in the form of transmitting the "aggregated list of the multicast information" (see Jain at col. 7, lines 55-67 and col. 8, lines 3-6). Thus, applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Additionally, applicant argues (pages 8-12) that Examiner has not provided motivation to modify Jain. However, the rejection of the claims clearly indicates modification is unnecessary because Jain, not the Examiner, implicitly teaches the claim limitations. While second and third reasons have been provided by the Examiner for how the teachings of Jain and the well known art alternatively imply the remainder of applicant's claim language (i.e., in the passages that follow "Alternatively, ..." and "Still further, ..." at page 5 of the Final Office action mailed April 27, 2006), the first reason, which stands alone, provided by Jain and relied upon Examiner for obviousness is a teaching clearly within the patented invention of Jain. That is, even though Jain may not specifically disclose that the address of the intermediate device 204 is a "group address", intermediate device implicitly performs the function of a group address because it serves as the common address for both VLAN 228 and 230 to register with devices 202 and 204 as VLAN 500 (e.g., see col. 8, lines 15 - col. 9, line 12). Thus, applicant's argument that it is improper for the Examiner to modify Jain is moot because it is the text of Jain that clearly implies this teaching, not the Examiner.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER 1/6/02

2